

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on December 18, 2009. Claims 1-7 and 10-18 were pending in that action and all claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 1-4, 10-15, and 18 are amended, claim 19 is new, and the remaining claims are unchanged. Consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

Interview

This communication further follows and interview with Examiner Hicks on March 18, 2010. The undersigned respectfully thanks Examiner Hicks for his time and consideration during the interview. In the interview, claims 1, 14 and 18 as presented herein were discussed. It is believed Examiner Hicks indicated that the features recited overcome the present rejection, but further searching would need to be performed.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 11-13 for depending upon the cancelled claim 9 instead of depending on claim 1. The claims have been amended to depend upon claim 1 instead of upon claim 9. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

35 USC §103

On pages 2-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the claims under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Olson U.S. Pat. No. 6,032,818 (hereinafter "Olson") in view of Aoyama Great Britain Pat. No. 2,117,736 (hereinafter "Aoyama") or as being unpatentable over Olson in view of Aoyama and in further view of Vallot U.S. Pat. No. 5,988,422 (hereinafter "Vallot"). With the present response, each of the independent claims and several of the dependent claims have been amended to recite new limitations and/or new combinations of limitations. Applicant respectfully contends that at least as amended that the claims are not anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited references. Applicant therefore respectfully contends that the claims are patentable and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

Claim 1 for instance has been amended to recite that the end sections of the first and second sheets include three sections. The claim has been further amended to recite how those sections are utilized in joining the claimed four sheets. An illustrative example of such an embodiment is shown in Applicant's FIG. 1 that shows end sections 11a, 11b, 11c, 13a, 13b, 13c, 21a, 23a, 23b, and 23c being utilized to join sheets 10, 20, 30, and 40. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claimed sheets as being disclosed by the sheets shown in Olson FIG. 9f. Applicant would like to note that sheets shown in Olson FIG. 9f as well as those shown in the other Olson figures do not teach or suggest the claimed multi-sectional ends. The other cited references similarly do not teach or suggest the claimed multi-sectional ends or joining four panels in the specific manner recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully contends that the claim is patentable.

Also for instance, claims 3, 15, and 19 have been amended to recite that the bag includes oblique seals. Claim 15 for example has been amended to recite that "the bag further includes a plurality of seals made at corners of the first and the second sheets, the plurality of seals running obliquely and with respect to side edges of the first and the second sheets, the plurality of seals closing off triangular sections of the bag." An illustrative example of such oblique seals is shown in Applicant's FIGS. 2 and 3 that show seals 61 and 62. Furthermore, page 12, lines 2-4 of Applicant's specification states that "as a consequence of these additional joins the foldable bag 1 in the unfolded state will assume a shape that has the shape of a rectangular, such as a cube or bar, more generally termed a block shape." In rejecting the claims, the Examiner cited Aoyama FIG. 6 and Vallot FIG. 1. As can be seen from an inspection of those figures, the cited references do not disclose including any oblique seals. Applicant further respectfully contends that the cited references do not include any suggestion or motivation to include such seals.

With this amendment, claims 19 and 20 have been added. It is respectfully believed these claims are separately patentable when the features recited therein are combined with the features recited in independent claims 18 and 14, respectively.

At least for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully claims that all claims are patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited. Applicant also respectfully requests that in the event that the Examiner does not find the independent claims patentable, that the Examiner consider allowance of one or more of the dependent claims.

Furthermore, the foregoing remarks are intended to assist the Office in examining the application and in the course of explanation may employ shortened or more specific or variant descriptions of some of the claim language. Such descriptions are not intended to limit the scope of the claims; the actual claim language should be considered in each case. Additionally, the remarks are not to be considered exhaustive of the facets of the invention which are rendered patentable, being only examples of certain advantageous features and differences, which Applicant's attorney chooses to mention at this time. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant reserves the right to submit additional evidence showing the distinction between Applicant's invention to be unobvious in view of the prior art. Also, in commenting on the references and in order to facilitate a better understanding of the differences that are expressed in the claims, certain details of distinction between the same and the present invention have been mentioned, even though such differences do not appear in all of the claims. It is not intended by mentioning any such unclaimed distinctions to create any implied limitations in the claims.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Kechler, Reg.No. 36,188
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone:(612) 334-3222 Fax:(612) 334-3312

SMK:NKB:dkm